

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CHINA POLICY FOR THE NEXT  
DECADE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for many years Members of Congress, and particularly members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, have profited from the active research and study efforts of the Atlantic Council. This highly respected association of some of the most prominent foreign policy thinkers has long performed a much needed service by tackling most difficult, yet relevant, problems facing the United States in its foreign relations.

Consistent with its earlier undertakings, the Atlantic Council has just completed a major study of United States-China policy. Given the great attention on U.S. relations with China and the prospects ahead, this study could not be more timely. Therefore, I ask that the executive summary and the list of members of the study group be included in the record at this point, so that my colleagues can have convenient access to the major findings of the Atlantic Council's work.

The executive summary follows:

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the euphoria of the US-PRC relationship has been replaced with the daily toil of managing the relationship, each side has grown to view the other with some caution. The present American administration has emphasized a greater concern about defense policy and the Chinese have exhibited a more assertive nationalism with calls for independence from the two superpowers, i.e. an intermediate position between the US and the USSR. Though Beijing is still in important aspects closer to Washington than to Moscow, tactical repositioning by the Chinese either closer to Moscow (as in 1982) or to the US (as appears to be emerging in 1983) has tended in the past to produce *ad hoc* policy responses by the US, responses which many of our friends and allies viewed as more emotional than pragmatic and not always supportive of their interests.

The Atlantic Council's Committee on China Policy has sought to appraise the interests of both countries, to understand where those interests converge or diverge, to break the romantic notions of inevitable harmony or hostility, and to recommend policies upon which to base a long-term relationship.

This policy paper examines the current state of bilateral relations between the United States and China; projects the most desirable and realistic objectives for the US government and ways to achieve them; surveys the prospective influence and likely interaction of other key actors who may influence the relationship; and discusses how the US can best coordinate its policies to satisfy the interests and allay the anxieties of its Atlantic and Pacific friends and allies

and to avoid complicating the Taiwan question.

The Committee then concludes with the following policy recommendations to the Administration concerning future policy of the United States toward China. These are recommendations the Committee believes the public and the Congress will endorse and that our friends and allies will recognize and support as contributing to global stability and their own security.

## GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The United States Government should develop a sound long-term posture through the next decade that seeks enhanced cooperation with the People's Republic of China (PRC)—a very large and underdeveloped country—which, as an independent, non-aligned international and regional entity, shares some but not all of our global and regional objectives, particularly in Asia and the Pacific.

2. An economically healthy, stable, and secure China, which contributes to the peace and stability of the region, is in the national interest of the United States, and is an interest shared by our Asian and European friends and allies. To this end, the United States should place priority on the continued development of a sound geopolitical relationship with China and on the enhancement of cooperation with China in developing its economic potential.

3. Relations with the PRC and other countries in the region require that the US maintain a strong military presence in East Asia and the Pacific and make clear we are committed to a forward military defense of our interests in the region.

4. The United States, more than it has the recent past, should consult with and take into account the views of its Asian friends and allies in dealing with the PRC and encourage reciprocal consultations. Specifically, the security and economic concerns of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the nations of ASEAN and ANZUS, and the population of Taiwan should be taken into account.

5. Our Atlantic friends and allies should also be consulted with respect to our China policies and encouraged to consult with the US with respect to their policies. It is important that our respective policies be compatible, particularly in the areas of technology transfer and international trade. The United States and its industrialized friends and allies in the coming decade should do in concert what we can to facilitate China's economic development. A process for continuing consultations among the allies should be established to facilitate cooperation in helping China in such areas as joint feasibility studies for projects to be financed by government funding.

## BILATERAL RELATIONS

6. The United States and China share certain geopolitical objectives, such as opposing Soviet expansionism, making possible cooperative efforts in various forms. Our policy objectives with respect to Afghanistan and Indochina are similar and call for further consultations. On the Korean Peninsula, despite the fact that the United States and China support different parties, our objectives in avoiding hostilities are parallel. The United States and the PRC

should urge their respective Korean allies to adopt policies supportive of these objectives. The United States should also encourage the PRC to develop further contacts with South Korea that could point the way to eventual cross-recognition. In other areas, such as the Middle East and Southern Africa, we should seek our common interest; and wherever and whenever our interests converge, we should cooperate.

7. The basis of our relations with China should not rest exclusively on our common opposition to the Soviet Union. We should seek to expand the basis of the relationship to rest on economic, scientific, and cultural ties, on shared efforts to maintain stability in Asia, and on Chinese involvement in the search for solutions to the problems that transcend national boundaries (such as arms limitations or international economic issues).

8. While the United States must show appreciation of Chinese needs, sensitivities, and domestic political environment, the same attitude is required of the PRC toward the United States. If the relationship is to move forward and continue to enjoy broad public support in the United States, the Chinese must demonstrate greater awareness of American sensitivities and appreciation of our domestic political system (including the separation of powers) and our pluralistic society. U.S. officials should make clear that Chinese rhetorical excesses only serve to undermine support in the United States for strengthening United States-Chinese relations and complicate US diplomacy on international issues.

9. Throughout the next decade, the United States should cooperate with the PRC primarily through trade, export credits, and direct investment in the Chinese economy. The United States should facilitate and promote US private sector participation in Chinese economic growth and encourage China to establish a favorable climate for American enterprises, as, for example, in the areas of developing coal, renewable energy resources, potential of off-shore oil and gas reserves, and agriculture.

10. To facilitate commercial trade in line with US export policies, the Committee recommends that the Joint Economic Commission and the Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade and their working groups should explore each other's laws and regulatory practices in order to defuse potentially disruptive trade issues stemming from asymmetries in business and government practices.

11. The US should actively promote the transfer of technologies that are consistent with China's economic development needs and abilities to absorb. At the same time, the US should continue to press the PRC to promulgate and enforce laws (patent, copyright, etc.) necessary to protect the interests of the industrialized nations in technology transferred. Correspondingly, the PRC should join such international agreements as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Paris Convention, and the Universal Copyright Conventions.

12. The Committee asserts that it is in the US national interest that the Chinese national economy move toward modernization. However, it recognizes this course involves a degree of risk since a strong Chinese indus-

trial base could be used in the future for military purposes not consistent with our national interest. To allay these fears, a broad study should be conducted to identify and quantify the probable impact of Western technology on China's industrial capability.

13. The US should quickly agree as to how best to expedite decisions on applications for the transfer of "dual-use" technologies and should be most responsive to those requests which would best contribute to the civilian sector (communications, transportation, power supplies, renewable resources, etc.). Technologies which make a direct and significant contribution to nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, electronic and anti-submarine warfare, and intelligence gathering should continue to be withheld, though each area should be carefully examined to ensure that only the most sensitive technologies are routinely denied.

14. The US government should not press weapons systems and technology on the Chinese, but rather should wait for their initiatives. The US should be responsive to requests from the Chinese armed forces, including arms sales, in developing China's ability to protect itself. This cooperation must be consistent with US law, international agreements, and commitments to allies of the United States. However, the US should not encourage the Chinese to carry out a program to modernize and expand its armed forces to a degree that would significantly increase the Chinese capacity to project force beyond its current borders. Neither should the United States seek to enter into a military alliance with the PRC.

15. In negotiations with the USSR on strategic and intermediate range nuclear missiles, both the US and the PRC should be sensitive to the possible interests and concerns of the other.

16. The United States should actively encourage and support the education and training of the Chinese in a variety of fields: scientific and technological as well as in the social sciences, the arts, and the humanities. It is in our national interest that the coming generation of leaders in China have exposure to, and benefit from, the best that can be offered by our universities, businesses, and other training facilities.

17. The United States should ensure the future of sound research and education about China by assuring direct access in China for our scholars, scientists, and journalists, by ensuring the continued funding of our library and research facilities, by enhancing our ability to acquire and utilize the large volume of Chinese language publications available, and by encouraging our China specialists to develop their background knowledge and language proficiency.

18. The US should not construe expected improvements in the Sino-Soviet relations as necessarily adverse to our national interests, but should judge such improvements with respect to their contribution, if any, to peace and stability in the region.

19. The Taiwan situation should be worked out peacefully by the Chinese on both sides of the Strait. The US Government should avoid promoting or coercing either party into adopting any particular solution, insisting only that the use of force be avoided.

#### MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHINA POLICY

Chairman: U. Alexis Johnson, Director, Atlantic Council; former Under Secretary of State, US Ambassador to Japan, Thailand, and Czechoslovakia, and Chief, US Delegation, SALT.

Rapporteur: George R. Packard, Dean, School for Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University; former Deputy Director, Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution.

Project director: Alfred D. Wilhelm, Jr., Senior Fellow, Atlantic Council.

#### Members

A. Doak Barnett, Member of the Board, National Committee on U.S.-China Relations; Professor of Chinese Studies, School for Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.

Ralph N. Clough, East Asian Scholar; former Fellow, Asia Society.

Terry Deibel, Professor, National War College.

Phillippe Deshormes, Secretary General, North Atlantic Assembly (Brussels).

Robert Dernberger, Professor of Economics, University of Michigan.

Job Dittberner, Director, Institutional and Political Affairs, North Atlantic Assembly (Brussels).

Russell E. Dougherty, Executive Director, Air Force Association; former Commander-in-Chief, SAC and Chief of Staff, SHAPE.

John K. Emmerson, Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University.

Carl W. Ford, Jr., Professional Staff Member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Henry H. Fowler, Chairman, International Division, Goldman Sachs & Co.; former Secretary of the Treasury.

Ellen L. Frost, Director, Government Programs, Westinghouse Electric Corporation; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Curt Gasteyer, Director, Programme for Strategic and International Security Studies, The Graduate Institute of International Studies (Geneva).

Jeffrey Gayner, Counselor for International Affairs, The Heritage Foundation.

William H. Gleysteen, Jr., Director, Asia Society; former U.S. Ambassador to Korea.

Andrew J. Goodpaster, former Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy; former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

John E. Gray, Chairman, International Energy Associates Limited.

Pyong-choon Hahn, Secretary General to the President of the Republic of Korea; former Professor of Law, Yonsei University (Seoul); former Korean Ambassador to the United States.

Harry Harding, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies Program, The Brookings Institution; former Professor of Political Science, Stanford University.

Eric W. Hayden, Vice President, Economic and Strategic Planning, Bank of America Asia Limited (Tokyo).

Martin J. Hillenbrand, Dean Rusk Professor of International Relations, University of Georgia; former Director General, Atlantic Institute for International Affairs (Paris) and U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Harold C. Hinton, Professor of Political Science, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University.

David S. Holland, Senior Vice President, Exploration, Pennzoil Exploration and Production Company.

William G. Hyland, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Masamichi Inoki, President, Research Institute for Peace and Security (Tokyo).

Thomas Kahn, Special Assistant to the President, AFL-CIO.

Franklin D. Kramer, Partner, Shea and Gardner.

Winston Lord, President, Council on Foreign Relations; former Assistant Secretary of State.

David E. McGiffert, Partner, Covington and Burling; former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

James W. Morley, Director, East Asian Institute, Columbia University.

Richard Nations, Correspondent, Far Eastern Economic Review.

Hisahiko Okazaki, Minister; former Director General for Foreign Relations, Japanese Defense Agency (Tokyo).

Michel Oksenberg, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan; former Staff Member (China), National Security Council.

Jan S. Prybyla, Professor of Economics, The Pennsylvania State University.

Christopher H. Phillips, President, National Council for US-China Trade.

James Reardon-Anderson, East Asian Librarian, Columbia University; former Professor of Asian Studies, School for Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.

Thomas W. Robinson, Sun Yat-sen Professor, Georgetown School of Foreign Service; former Professor, National War College.

Rainer Rupp, Economic Directorate, NATO Headquarters (Brussels).

Nathaniel Samuels, Advisory Director, Lehman Kuhn Loeb Inc.; former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Robert A. Scalapino, Professor of Political Science, University of California (Berkeley); Member, National Committee on US-China Relations.

Brent Scowcroft, Lt. General, US Air Force (retired); former Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Raymond Philip Shafer, Chairman, National Committee on United States-China Relations; Partner, Coopers and Lybrand; former Governor of Pennsylvania.

Gaston J. Sigur,<sup>1</sup> Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University.

Richard H. Solomon, Head, Social Science Department, Rand Corporation; former Staff Member (China), National Security Council.

Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Guest Scholar, The Brookings Institution; former Counselor, Department of State.

Douglas T. Stuart, Director, University of Southern California School of International Relations (Munich); NATO Fellow.

Leonard Sullivan, Jr., Defense policy consultant, System Planning Corporation; former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Robert G. Sutter, Specialist in Asian Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Gregory G. Tallas, Vice President, The First National Bank of Chicago.

William T. Tow, Professor, University of Southern California School of International Relations (Munich); NATO Fellow.

Philip H. Trezise, Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution; former US Ambassador to OECD.

Leonard Unger, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University; former US Ambassador to Taiwan.

Roy Werner, Corporate Director, Policy Research, Northrop Corporation.

<sup>1</sup> Served until accepting a position on the National Security Council staff.



Allen S. Whiting, Professor, University of Arizona.

Mike Witunski, Corporate Staff Vice President, McDonnell Douglas Corporation.

Joseph J. Wolf, Rapporteur, Atlantic Council's Committee on NATO; former Minister, US Delegation to NATO.

#### Ex Officio Members

Theodore C. Achilles, Vice Chairman, Atlantic Council.

Joseph W. Harned, Deputy Director General, Atlantic Council.

Kenneth Rush, Chairman, Atlantic Council.

Francis O. Wilcox, Director General, Atlantic Council.

#### Project assistants

Eliane Lomax, Atlantic Council  
Robert Means, Atlantic Council.

Student intern: Rosemary Brennan, Temple University and Nankai University.●

### THE 66TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOLSHIEV REVOLU- TION—A DAY OF SORROW

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, November 7 marks the 66th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. At this time I would like to recognize this day as a day of sorrow and irreconcilability.

Since they seized power in 1917 the Soviets have oppressed and enslaved not only the Russian people but the many peoples of Eastern Europe as well. These people continue to live under the brutality and repressiveness of Communist tyranny. November 7, 1917, also marked the beginning of Soviet-sponsored aggression and terrorism throughout the world.

The list of innocent victims of Soviet-sponsored aggression is endless. Soviet tyranny continues to oppress and brutalize its victims in all regions of the world. The recent Korean Air Lines massacre and continued Soviet support of Communist terrorism in Central America gravely threaten the peace and stability of the free world.

By recognizing the 66th anniversary of the Communist takeover in Russia as a day of sorrow, we commemorate and mourn all those who have perished as a result of Communist oppression. It also displays our unbending support for all those still living under the yoke of Communist tyranny who seek freedom and self-determination.

The history of communism, as practiced by the Soviet Union, is one of oppression, enslavement, and disregard for human rights. This legacy continues, and in our recognition of the 66th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution we must express, without equivocation, our irreconcilability with communism and our undying resolve to defend the rights and liberty of free peoples throughout the world.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the following statement made by the Congress of Russian-Americans:

CONGRESS OF RUSSIAN-AMERICANS, INC.,  
Long Island City, N.Y., October 1983.

#### THE DAY OF SORROW AND IRRECONCILABILITY, 1983

As we approach the 7th of November, the day when the Soviet Union annually celebrates international communism's arrogation of power in Russia, we—Russian-Americans—appeal to the U.S. Government and to freedom loving citizens of this country to designate this day as the Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability.

Sadly, albeit fittingly, among all the ethnic groups comprising the tapestry of these United States of America, only the Russian-Americans persist in annually asking their Government and their fellow Americans to observe this inglorious day. Russian-Americans feel it is their sacred duty to mark with mourning and defiance the day international communism claimed their former countrymen as their first victim. Moreover, Russians living under Soviet rule acutely realize that with every new nation saddled with the yoke of communism their burden becomes not lighter, but immeasurably greater. Still, their determination to live free blazes as never before.

On this infamous day we express our sorrow for all the victims of communist terror, and our irreconcilability with the theory and practice of communist doctrine.

Last year, our declaration enumerated the crimes committed by the Soviet government within the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. We asked all concerned to share with us our feelings of sorrow and irreconcilability.

This year we wish to emphasize that November 7, 1917 marked not only the beginning of immeasurable sufferings of the Russian and other enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union, but also the beginning of a global human tragedy which today threatens the very existence of the Free World.

By using the territories of the former Russian empire as a base for its attack upon the Free World, while mercilessly exploiting and deceiving its materially and spiritually impoverished citizens, the Soviet government created a mighty military state capable of dictating its will to the Free World. Utilizing the atomic threat, the Soviets gradually take over key strategic positions in all parts of the world.

It seems that today there is not a single nation on the face of the earth that has not been victimized by communist aggression. Today we must count among the communist victims peaceful U.S. citizens who perished in the Korean airliner shot down at the orders of the Soviet government.

Therefore, to stem the tide of communist aggression, we ask the government of the United States of America and, through its good services, all other Free World governments, to designate November 7th, the day when the Soviets will be displaying their military might, as the Day of Mourning for All Victims of Communist Terror and fly all flags at half-mast.

We also ask representatives of all peoples enslaved by international communism to join us in conducting memorial services on this day and pray for all those still living under the yoke of communist tyranny.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
Congress of Russian Americans.●

#### PAINFUL MEDICINE FOR PHYSICIANS

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, When the House considers the Tax Reform Act of 1983, the Ways and Means Committee will offer an amendment for medicare savings. I offer my support for this amendment, and I would like to explain why.

Health care costs are receiving widespread attention today. In 1982, total hospital spending rose by \$17.9 billion, or 15 percent. The February Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 3.5 percent; hospital charges rose 13.2 percent, or nearly four times the CPI. Increases are attributed in part to more costly technologies, the fact that medicare and Medicaid do not cover full hospital charges for care, and inadequate government regulation to control health care costs. Third-party—insurance company—payments for health care encourage overuse of hospital facilities and services.

The economic stabilization program represented initial Federal intervention in the early 1970's. It held the health care inflation rate down to 5.7 percent but it was then abandoned. Without Federal controls, hospitals charges increased dramatically—17.2 percent in 1975. But a number of States recognized the need for Government action. They developed overall cost control programs, which on the average have held down the rate of increase to 2 percentage points below the national average.

The rapid growth in health care costs, combined with other adverse economic circumstances, are taking their toll on medicare's hospital insurance trust fund. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the fund's reserves will be exhausted by 1990. Expenditures are also rapidly rising in the supplementary medical insurance fund—part B. Because three-fourths of part B is financed by general revenues, it is not in danger of bankruptcy. However, to meet its projected demands, the Congressional Budget Office projects that \$31.9 billion in general funds will be needed in 1988, compared to \$14.2 billion this year, a 225-percent increase in just 4 years.

Over the past 3 years Congress has enacted medicare cuts totaling \$25 billion through 1986 in attempts to reduce medicare's financial burden. To date, spending reductions in medicare have been achieved through specific program changes, by increasing beneficiaries' out-of-pocket payments—part A and B deductibles and coinsurance—and by limiting the amount which

medicare pays to hospitals and physicians.

The Social Security reform bill changed medicare's payment system and reduced payment rates. Effective October 1, 1983, the program is designed to provide incentives to hospitals to control costs and streamline care. The Social Security Advisory Council, which convenes every 4 years to review the financial status of the system, is focusing on medicare this year. Although the Council's final report is not due until December 1983, it has tentatively recommended revising hospital insurance—part A—benefits, increasing the part A premium, varying premiums by income, increasing the age for eligibility, physician assignment, and voluntary vouchers.

One of the Council's tentative recommendations, physician assignment, is embodied in the Ways and Means Committee amendment. Currently, hospital-based physicians may bill medicare patients for the amount of their services which medicare does not pay. This amendment requires hospital-based physicians who agree to treat medicare patients to accept medicare payment as payment in full—called medicare assignment. It also freezes the rate of payment for 6 months—from January 1, 1984, to June 30, 1984—at the June 30, 1983 level. It requires hospitals participating in medicare to obtain from doctors on their staffs an agreement to accept medicare assignment.

Some health care professionals claim that some doctors would stop treating medicare patients, so patients' access to their doctors might be limited or eliminated. Critics also claim that this amendment sets a dangerous precedent in requiring acceptance of assignment. But the system already has a precedent of assignment in that three-fourths of medicare payments to hospitals and other providers are based on assignment. In addition, the amendment does not require hospitals to enforce their agreement with physicians, and does not impose new penalties on physicians.

Certainly some doctors will stop treating medicare patients for this period. Certainly subcommittee hearings would help us clarify our choices. But we are faced with a system that will be involuntarily in the very near future if we do not act quickly and decisively. We have incorporated budget savings in medicare through reforms imposed on hospitals and beneficiaries. Unfortunately, physicians must share in the savings reforms. This proposal is a reasonable approach, especially since physicians are not required to treat medicare patients.

I congratulate my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee for working to assure medicare's future solvency. I encourage reforms which provide incentives for high quality, cost effective

care, rather than encouraging increased visits and procedures. As Congress discusses medicare's solvency, as well as health care costs in general, it is inevitable that all groups will have to suffer some cuts. I hope that hospital-based physicians will accept our sincere good intentions to insure a sound medicare system, and will continue to work with legislators to control health care costs.●

#### HEALTH CARE EXCELLENCE

#### HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the work of two physicians who are contributing to the transformation of our health care delivery system. Their names are Dr. Kenneth R. Dardick and Dr. Lawrence H. Bernstein, and together they recently received the Patient Care Award for Excellence in Patient Education, sponsored by Patient Care magazine.

Dr. Dardick and Dr. Bernstein operate what is called a family practice, which is dedicated to the concept that the patient is an intelligent responsible partner who can participate actively in his or her health care. Mr. Speaker, I feel it imperative, if we are ever to stop the upward spiral of health care spending, that programs such as these be initiated all over the country. It is only when patients become informed enough to make intelligent health care decisions that they will attempt to have a say in the quality and cost of the treatment they are receiving.

The dedication of Dr. Dardick and Dr. Bernstein is exemplified in their approach to the care of newborns, infants and young families. New parents and children need support, understanding and guidance from the family physician. Dr. Dardick and Dr. Bernstein supply this support system beginning shortly after the pregnancy is diagnosed. Reading lists are given to the parents. If necessary the books are made available to the family. Throughout the pregnancy the doctors discuss with the mother and the father the complex issues the family faces with the pregnancy and with the birth of the child.

The school systems are a major resource which Dr. Bernstein and Dr. Dardick have used to provide community education as well. The doctors have participated in question-and-answer sessions with nursery school parents, have served as consultants for nursery school staff and for public school nurses. They have met with schoolchildren to discuss many sub-

jects including "medical research," "heart health and fitness," "the effects of smoking," and "what happens during a physical exam." One doctor developed a wall chart detailing the common childbirth illnesses as a teaching tool for parents, school nurses and teachers. The chart is now being distributed to every school by the State department of education.

The doctors have sponsored many adult education programs for the community at large. The topics, such as "cardiovascular disease," "how to cope with stress," "routine preventive care," and "common childhood illnesses" aim to provide a basic health education to the public.

The elderly, disabled, and homebound are likewise well attended by the physicians. A program was designed to teach the lay caretaker the fundamentals of nutrition, physical therapy, and assistive devices. The level of care provided by these caretakers has improved significantly.

Dr. Bernstein and Dr. Dardick have long recognized the obligation of the physician to serve as an activist in the community, to do the most good for the most people. I would like to honor and commend them.●

#### H.R. 4102: THE WRONG BILL AT THE WRONG TIME

#### HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that a number of diverse editorial voices from around the country have reached the same conclusion about H.R. 4102, the Universal Telephone Service Preservation Act. This conclusion is that this is the wrong bill at the wrong time.

I recommend that my colleagues in the House read the following editorials before H.R. 4102 is considered in the House this week. For example, the Detroit News concludes that "Congressional champions of 'universal service' are rushing to regulate against imaginary inequities at an unknown cost." The Washington Post indicates that "as serious social policy the case for it has long since evaporated." And the New York Times opines that if Congress passes such legislation, it would "surrender to political panic and vote to retard change."

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Detroit News, Oct. 20, 1983]

#### SHOOTING IN THE DARK

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) took Congress by surprise this week and delayed from January 1 to April 3 a controversial order that would have added a \$2 charge for access to long-distance service to residential phone bills.



The FCC delay can be read as an effort to defuse a congressional push to overturn the access charge scheme. Yet the delay is unlikely to ease the clash between the FCC and AT&T on the one hand and Congress on the other because more than a \$2 charge is at stake. On Jan. 1, the court ordered divestiture of AT&T will take place. The FCC is seeking to accommodate a new era of increased competition, while opponents in Congress look back with longing to the safety of Ma Bell's arms.

Once AT&T is severed from the bell operating companies offering basic, local phone service, it is acknowledged by all that the cost of basic telephone service will go up. AT&T's lucrative long-distance service will no longer subsidize low local phone rates as in the past. However, competition and innovation by AT&T, MCI, GTE, ITT, and others will be driving the cost of long-distance service down. The net impact on consumers is unknown.

Basic phone rates will go up, perhaps double in many states, for a variety of reasons. Most of the increase is a result of divestiture, including the direct cost of the breakup, new equipment, the downgrading of Bell company bond ratings, and the loss of AT&T revenue opportunities. Congress can do little about this.

However, the \$2 residential charge is something Congress can change. The FCC ruling shifts some of the burden of defraying local operating company costs from the long-distance carrier to the consumer. It means an access charge of \$2 a month for residential users and \$6 for business users, increasing to an average of \$8 to \$12 by 1990.

The House Energy and Commerce and the Senate Commerce Committees, have constructed bills designed to either eliminate the \$2 residential charge (the House version) or delay its implementation until 1986 (the Senate version). Businesses would still pay an access charge, but long-distance carriers would subsidize residential rates. Both bills set up special funds to ensure telephone service at subsidized rates for rural and low-income people.

The House bill, championed by Trenton Democratic Rep. John Dingell, would set up funds of about \$1.1 billion to defray costs of service for low-income users and high-cost (rural) areas. The universal service fund would be filled by a charge to long-distance carriers. The Senate bill establishes similar funds totaling \$400 million for high-cost areas and low-income supports. However, in the case of low-income users, half of the cost of the subsidy would be paid by a fund of charges to long-distance carriers and half by the states.

It is unclear whether consumers will be better off due to these efforts.

Residential customers, first of all, will lose the lower long-distance rates that would have been possible with the greater cost-savings of long-distance carriers. Second, if big business customers, who make up the biggest share of phone revenues, use private lines to dodge the public system and the heavier subsidy burden of business, phone companies will be forced to raise residential rates even higher. Congressional efforts to assess fees on the "bypassers" may only partially recoup such losses. Finally, in the Senate case, the consumers may be burdened by either higher state taxes or budget cuts in order to subsidize low-income phone users.

It is clear that Congress is shooting in the dark. For example, studies show that rural

and poor phone users make a disproportionately high number of long-distance calls, so that savings there may offset their increased basic service rates. In addition, as rates begin to more closely reflect the cost of usage, consumers and suppliers will have an incentive to economize. Phone companies have suggested that multiparty lines, limited calls and dialing area, and flat rate usage charges are options for consumers who want to cut costs.

The FCC's ruling that the access to long-distance should be charged to those who use long-distance is a market approach novel only because we have grown up with the Ma Bell monopoly. Only experience can tell us who gains and who loses in the new system, and reform can then be tailored to fit the facts. Congressional champions of "universal service" are rushing to regulate against imaginary inequities at an unknown cost.

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1983]

#### YOUR PHONE BILL

The usual shrieks of protest arose last week when the Federal Communications Commission took its decision on phone rates before a couple of congressional committees. If you had been there, you might have got the impression that the rapacious FCC was determined to raise your telephone bill, with nothing to stop it but a few courageous congressmen sworn to protect the poor and defenseless. Can that be true?

No, of course not. The issue is the subsidy that the long-distance phone rates have traditionally conferred on the local service. Changes in communications technology now make it necessary to end that subsidy, a process that is never painless.

The subsidy in this case is very large—as the FCC calculates it, about \$10.7 billion a year, or nearly 40 percent of total long-distance revenues. For decades government regulators have deliberately kept long-distance service overpriced and local service underpriced with the intention of enabling everyone to afford a phone. The idea worked tolerably well as long as there was only one national unified system, AT&T. But now other companies are competing with AT&T for its long-distance business. If AT&T is forced to continue the overcharges, its competitors will eat it up. If the regulators force the competitors to help carry the overcharges, the big customers will shift to private systems beyond the reach of the regulators. Many large companies already operate their own systems, and they are proliferating rapidly.

The FCC has concluded, correctly, that it's time to end the whole tottering structure of overcharges and subsidies. It wants to do that gradually, over the next six years, starting with an increase next January of \$2 a month for each residential line. The FCC, incidentally, has made its own contribution to the confusion by calling this increase an "access" charge. It's not. It's simply the first step in bringing the price of local service up to the full cost, as the subsidy declines.

A lot of congressmen want to write legislation to continue subsidizing local phone bills. It won't work. The technology will keep outrunning them. If they want to address the small number of genuine hardship cases, the way to do it is through a small increase in the present federal tax on phone service. But, as the FCC points out, the cost of phone service after inflation has dropped 30 percent over the past decade. While the price of local service goes up, the price of long-distance calls will keep coming down. After all these years the subsidy evokes a

certain sentimental affection. But as serious social policy the case for it has long since evaporated.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1983]

#### PUTTING CONGRESS ON HOLD

The Federal Communications Commission wants residential telephone users to pay \$2 a month and businesses as much as \$6 a month for access to long distance. But Congress, fearful of a backlash when the proposed rates start in January, threatens to overrule the decision. That would be an ill-informed mistake.

To the F.C.C.'s critics, the access charges are another assault on common sense by economic theoreticians bent on tinkering with the best telephone system in the world. In fact, flat-fee access charges are no threat to phone service. Far from it. They would produce better service for no more money. Congress seems not to understand that—and should not rush to judge until it does.

A few decades ago, long distance was an expensive luxury in a telephone system built primarily for local use. The way long-distance costs were apportioned was relatively unimportant. But new technology has dramatically changed the economics of telecommunications. Today, the real cost of calling cross-country is only slightly greater than calling crosstown.

Yet for reasons of inertia and politics, the regulators have only recently begun to adjust rates accordingly. Despite this failure to adjust, American phone service remains first-rate. Why should we tinker with it now? In part, because technology forces us to.

Long-distance callers will pay inflated charges only if they have no alternative. Now, heavy users can create their own satellite communications systems, entirely bypassing Ma Bell and her high rates. For the moment, such systems carry only a tiny fraction of long-distance traffic, but the handwriting is on the wall if not in the airwaves: long-distance charges must come down.

Long-distance callers share the use of billions in equipment in local phone company offices. On average, a quarter of the messages traveling along local wires are long-distance. To compensate the local phone companies, long-distance users are now billed for about a quarter of the local equipment costs, about 15 cents a minute.

What's wrong with that? Once local systems are built, it costs little or nothing to provide access to long distance. The 15-cent-a-minute charge thus needlessly discourages long-distance calls. So Billy calls home from college once a month rather than once a week. Businesses spend \$4 to type and mail a message that would cost the phone companies only \$3 to handle. Multiply that by millions of long-distance calls not made each day and you get some idea of what the inefficiency costs.

With fixed access rates, individual long-distance calls will cost less, encouraging people to make more of them, thus creating more efficient use of the whole phone system.

Critics charge that to rely more on fixed access fees would force poor people to give up their phones. If that were a realistic danger, more efficient use of long distance might not be worth the social cost. But it's not realistic. In fact, the F.C.C. has invited phone companies to create cheap, no-frills "lifeline" service if they haven't already established it.

Congress has a choice. It can surrender to political panic and vote to retard change, hoping that long-distance callers don't find ways to beat the overcharges. Or it can allow a gradual transition to efficient, cost-based pricing, taking care to protect access to phone service at reasonable prices. And that is no choice at all.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE LOUIS TELANO

##### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a 23-year veteran of the New York City Police Department, it is my pleasure today to honor Detective Louis "Tonto" Telano who after 28 years of dedicated service to the citizens of New York, is retiring.

On November 10, 1983, Detective Telano will be honored at a testimonial dinner given by his friends and colleagues for a colorful career that has spanned three decades. As one-half of the undercover team of the Lone Ranger and Tonto, Detective Telano has achieved the reputation as one of the most innovative and one of the toughest cops in New York City. Detective Telano, with his partner John Sepe, "the Lone Ranger," are credited with one of the highest number of arrests in New York City's history. As an undercover officer for the New York City Housing Authority which has the responsibility for the city's 192 housing projects, Detective Telano's days often found him trying to preserve his anonymity by dressing up in disguises so as not to alert his suspects. He and his partner often materialized as construction workers, Good Humor men, insurance salesmen, junkies, and as Hassidic rabbis. Once, they both reverted to their prior occupations as sanitation workers to make a drug arrest. Detective Telano's appetite for undercover work has carried him virtually unscathed through several knife fights and many shootouts. Once as a patrolman, Telano was bitten in the line of duty by the enraged girl friend of a narcotics dealer he had just arrested.

I feel that this tribute would not be complete without mentioning the many citations and awards Louis Telano has received over the years, which number over 75. I had the privilege of being present 5 years ago when Detective Telano received the Public Safety Award from the New York City Correction Officers Benevolent Association of which he was also a member from 1961 to 1968. Shortly before that award, Detective Telano was named New York area vice president of the American Law Enforcement Officers Association. In addition to these honors and positions, Detective Telano

has also served as president of the New York City Housing Authority's Detective Endowment's Association, vice president of the Fraternal Order of Police and just recently, in January 1983, was inducted into the "Who's Who in Law Enforcement."

Detective Louis Telano's upcoming retirement will not take this outstanding officer out of the public eye however. At the age of 49, Louis Telano will remain active. He has started his own business of Tonto Investigations and Security—a bodyguard and electronics surveillance agency in Brooklyn. I wish him much luck and success as he takes on this endeavor, but I know he will not need it—he will be doing what he does best.

I remember with great fondness the days when I was a young police officer—they were the finest days of my life. It is my pleasure to share in the honoring of another officer who has made police work his life. I join Louis' wife, Elizabeth, his seven children—two of whom are following in their father's footsteps—one a New York State trooper and one a New York City police officer—and all of the people whose lives have been affected by Louis Telano in saying "Congratulations Tonto for a job very well done."●

#### THE CHEERFUL IGNORANCE OF THE YOUNG

##### HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow colleagues an article which appeared in the Washington Post on October 3, 1983. It brings to light the shocking and almost unbelievable lack of knowledge that some of America's youth possess about not only this country's past but an overall lack of understanding of world history, geography, and everyday current events.

If the youth of this country have no idea as to why we have the freedoms and liberties that we do, then how can we expect them to safeguard and respect our laws and Constitution, and uphold the beliefs and spiritual values of our Nation.

The individuals mentioned in this article are not the uneducated, illiterate of this country. They are students of such notable educational institutions as the University of California and the University of Southern California.

I hope my colleagues will take the time necessary to review the article that follows:

#### THE CHEERFUL IGNORANCE OF THE YOUNG IN LOS ANGELES

(By Benjamin J. Stein)

LOS ANGELES.—I spend a lot of time with teenagers. Besides employing three of them part-time, I frequently conduct focus groups at Los Angeles area high schools to learn about teen-agers' attitudes toward movies or television shows or nuclear arms or politicians. I meet the friends of the teen-agers who work for me. I make it my business not only to meet those young people, but also to ask them about their lives and about what they know. In the course of two years of this kind of inquiry, I have collected a mass of data about how teen-agers see business (very negatively), how they feel about the likelihood of nuclear war (terrified), how they like Richard Gere (a lot), and how they feel about American cars (extremely negative).

But all of these specific attitudes pale into insignificance compared with something else I have learned of: the astounding level of ignorance of the Southern California teen-ager. No amount of preparation could possibly cushion the blows of unawareness of even the most elementary current events, history, politics, economics, or just what goes on each day in the world outside of Los Angeles which lurks in the cheerful minds of these children. I have not figured out a way to quantify this ignorance, but I can offer a few examples that might just make you wonder where all that money for public education is going.

Recently a 19-year-old junior at the University of Southern California sat with me while I watched "Guadalcanal Diary" on TV. It goes without saying that the child had never heard of Guadalcanal. More surprisingly, she did not know who the United States was fighting against in the Pacific. ("The Germans?") She was genuinely shocked to learn that all those little people on that island were Japanese and that the United States had fought a war against them. ("Who won?")

Another student at USC did not have any clear idea when World War II was fought. She believed it was some time this century. (She is a journalism major.) She also had no clear notion of what had begun the war for the United States. ("Pearl Harbor? Was that when the United States dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima?") Even more astounding, she was not sure which side Russia was on and whether Germany was on our side or against us.

In fact, I have not yet found one single student in Los Angeles, in either college or high school, who could tell me the years when World War II was fought. Nor have I found one who could tell me the years when World War I was fought. Nor have I found one who knew when the American Civil War was fought.

Not one could name all the presidents since World War II. Only one could even place the correct decade in which Dwight Eisenhower was president. Not one could tell me who Martin Luther King Jr. was except that he was black. A few have known how many U.S. senators California has, but none has known how many Nevada or Oregon has. ("Really? Even though they're so small?") Of at least 10 whom I have asked, only one could name both of California's senators.

Of the (at least) 12 whom I have asked, none has known within 40 million what the population of the United States is. Only two could tell me where Chicago is, even in the



vague terms. (My particular favorite geography lesson was the junior at the University of California at Los Angeles who thought that Toronto must be in Italy. My second-favorite geography lesson is the junior at USC, a pre-law student, who thought that Washington, D.C. was in Washington state.) None had even the vaguest idea of where New England is, and several had never heard of Vermont or Connecticut and could not identify them as states of the Union.

Not so long ago, I watched a television news show about the so-called "lifting" of martial law in Poland. On the screen were pictures of Poles in large pen-like enclosures rounded up after martial law was imposed. One of my assistants, a junior at USC, stared at the screen open-mouthed.

"What's going on there?" she asked. "Why are those people in that big cage?"

I explained that they had been imprisoned as the result of a crackdown by the communist government. "Why don't they just leave and come to L.A.?" she asked. I explained that they were not allowed to leave.

"They're not?" she said. "Why not?"

I explained that in totalitarian states citizens usually could not emigrate.

"They can't?" she said. "Since when? Is that something new?"

After some explanation of that, she asked who "that guy in the uniform" (Wojciech Jaruzelski) was. I explained that he is the dictator of Poland. "He is?" she asked. "Why does he do that?"

She then expressed amazement that there were such things as non-free countries in the world. She had never known that before. She was amazed that there was a whole array of countries around Russia which were controlled by Russia. ("There are? Why doesn't Reagan make them stop?") She was also amazed that people could be and were put in prison for expressing political views in Russia. ("What a burnt idea.") Finally, she wondered why she had never been told about this subject before.

Of the teen-agers with whom I work, none had ever heard of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Only one could identify Josef Stalin. (My favorite answer "He was president just before Roosevelt.") Only two could even approximately identify Thomas Jefferson. Only one could place the date of the Declaration of Independence. None could name even one of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution or connect them with the Bill of Rights. Only one knew even roughly when the Great Depression was. None could say even approximately when Lyndon Johnson was president.

Only a few could articulate in any way at all why life in a free country is different from life in an un-free country. None had ever heard of the Warsaw Pact. None could tell me what NATO stood for. ("Aren't they the ones who put up the space shuttle and all those things?")

On and on it went. On and on it goes. I have mixed up episodes of ignorance of facts with ignorance of concepts because it seems to me that there is a connection. If a student has no idea when World War II was and who the combatants were and what they fought over, that same human being is likely to be ignorant of just what this society stands for. If a young woman has never heard of the Bill of Rights, that young woman is unlikely to understand why this is a uniquely privileged nation with uniquely privileged citizens, young and old. If a student has never heard of the Warsaw Pact and has no idea what the Russian system is

all about, that student is unlikely to understand why sacrifice is necessary to defend this society.

The examples here could be repeated almost endlessly. (One night in 1982, I watched a TV miniseries about Adolf Hitler. In the series, a demented, defeated Hitler rants that he never wanted war, that it was forced on him by Russia and England. One of my friends at UCLA said to me while watching, "Why did Russia and England do that?") The point is that in a state of such astonishing ignorance, young Americans may well not be prepared for even the most basic national responsibility—understanding what the society is about and why it must be preserved. The kids I saw (and there may be lots of others who are different) are not mentally prepared to continue the society because they basically do not understand the society enough to value it.

None of this means that the children in my circle are bad children or inherently flawed. Far from it. They are fine human beings. Their comments often bring tears of joy to my eyes. Recently, two of them read an article in the newspaper about a militantly anti-Semitic organization. One of them pointed at the word "anti-Semite" and said, "What's this word?" I explained that it was someone who hated Jews for no other reason than that they were Jews. The girl looked at me with genuine amazement and asked, "Why would anyone do that?" The other girl said, "What is it again? I never heard of that."

I respectfully suggest that we should be happy and proud to have such gilded, innocent children in our midst. But unless they are given some concept of why the society must be protected and defended, I fear that they will learn too soon about a whole variety of ugly ideas they did not want to know about. If we are going to upgrade our educational system, if we are going to start teaching again, I hope we will begin by instructing young Americans with historical facts and with concepts about why the society is worth preserving. People who do not value what they have rarely keep it for long, and neither will we.●

#### A GOLD MEDAL FOR DANNY THOMAS

#### HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously adopted a resolution which calls for a gold medal to be struck by the Treasury Department in recognition of an outstanding humanitarian and American who stands as example to all people of the true meaning of faith and commitment. This fine man to be fittingly honored by this distinguished and rare award is my friend Danny Thomas. Danny Thomas is close to the hearts of all the people of my home district in Memphis, Tenn., where in 1962 he founded the St. Jude Children's Research Center.

This wonderful children's hospital has dedicated the past 21 years to finding a cure for the catastrophic dis-

eases which afflict children. Danny Thomas made a vow to the patron saint of the hopeless in 1940 to repay the blessings of his life if it should ever amount to much. In the late 1950's he sought the advice of his close friend Cardinal Cushing Stritch in Chicago on how he should fulfill his commitment. Being a native Memphian, Cardinal Stritch suggested a children's hospital in Memphis. When St. Jude Children's Research Hospital opened its doors in 1962, the young patients entering with leukemia had only a 5 percent survival rate. Today, those leukemia victims have over a 50-percent chance of survival. The dramatic increase is due to the tremendous strides made through St. Jude's Cancer Research Center.

Danny Thomas has tirelessly given of his time and resources to make St. Jude Children's Research Hospital the hope to the families and the children struck by grievous illness. These patients receive the latest in medical care at no cost to the children or their families. Most of the funds which support Saint Jude's come from private contributions. Currently, the hospital has a budget of \$40.3 million.

Through St. Jude Children's Research Center, Danny Thomas has given the most precious gift of life to thousands of children. It is befitting that this gold medal of honor be given to him as a tribute to his generous humanitarian spirit.●

#### REAGAN ADMINISTRATION FIGHTS SEX BIAS

#### HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, among the best kept secrets of our time are the efforts of the Reagan administration, through the Justice Department, to fight sex discrimination.

An example is contained in the New York Times story, November 1, 1983, page A-21, written by Linda Greenhouse concerning a case now before the Supreme Court on the issue of whether title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies to the selection of partners in a law firm.

In the seventh paragraph of this important story, we note that "The Justice Department joined in Mrs. Hishon's appeal to the Supreme Court."

It is not amiss to note that if the media disagreed with the administration's position, it would be identified as "The Reagan Administration," but when the administration supports an attack on sex discrimination the operative phrase is "The Justice Department."

I share Ms. Greenhouse's article with my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 1, 1983]  
COURT EXAMINES SEX BIAS IN PICKING LAW PARTNERS

(By Linda Greenhouse)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 31—The Supreme Court gave a skeptical hearing today to the argument by a major law firm that the Federal law against employment discrimination does not apply to a law firm's decision on which young lawyers should become partners.

Several Justices appeared incredulous when Charles Morgan Jr., a one-time civil rights lawyer now representing King & Spalding, a big Atlanta law firm, said a law firm is free under Federal law to offer all its male associates a chance at a partnership after six years of employment, while requiring all the women to wait 10 years.

"Why doesn't that fall squarely within the act?" Associate Justice John Paul Stevens asked Mr. Morgan.

#### PARTNERSHIP PROMOTION DENIED

"Because the act doesn't apply to partnership," was the reply.

The question before the Court was whether title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, race and religion, applies to the partnership decision.

The case, which has stirred intense interest within the legal profession, began as a lawsuit by Elizabeth A. Hishon, a 1972 honors graduate of Columbia Law School who was denied a partnership at King & Spalding after seven years of employment as an associate. At that time the firm had never had a woman as a partner; the only other woman it had employed as a lawyer remained an associate for 33 years.

Mrs. Hishon's suit was dismissed in Federal District Court. The United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit upheld the dismissal, ruling that a law partnership was a "voluntary joinder," like a marriage, to which Title VII did not apply.

#### BACKED BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The Justice Department joined in Mrs. Hishon's appeal to the Supreme Court (Hishon v. King & Spalding, No. 82-940). Paul M. Bator, a deputy solicitor general, told the Justices that it was not necessary to place a label on the relationship of partners to one another. Rather, he said, the case was a straightforward matter of an employee seeking equal opportunity.

"Title VII clearly and sharply provides that women employees may not be treated worse than male employees," Mr. Bator said. "She was an employee, and her complaint was that she was treated worse than the other associates."

That was a somewhat narrower argument than the one put forward by Mrs. Hishon's own lawyer, Emmet J. Bondurant 2d. Mr. Bondurant said he agreed with the Government that the case could be approached as a classic case of an employee who did not receive an equal opportunity for advancement. But he also urged the Court to rule that partners, too, despite their status as co-owners of the law firm, are governed by Title VII in their relationships to one another as well as to their employees.

#### ARGUMENT SEEMED TOO BROAD

Associate Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., a former senior partner of a major Richmond law firm, was disturbed by the potential breadth of that argument. "So any partner down through the years may claim a violation of Title VII?" over compensation or status within the firm, Justice Powell asked. Mr. Bondurant answered "yes."

The Court's scorn, however, was reserved for the argument Mr. Morgan presented on behalf of King & Spalding. He asserted that as "enforcers of the Constitution," lawyers deserve special constitutional protection from "Government regulation," including the civil rights laws. In any event, he insisted, Congress meant to exempt all partnerships from Title VII.

"Now, Mr. Morgan," Associate Justice Sandra Day O'Connor said in a tone of strained patience. "Congress well knew how to write exemptions into the law when it wanted to. You are asking us to create one ourselves." Justice O'Connor herself was offered a job as a secretary at a major Los Angeles law firm after her graduation near the top of her class at Stanford Law School. ●

#### CUTTING THE DAIRY SURPLUS

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, if there is any agency concerned by the cost of programs to the Government, it is the Office of Management and Budget. So it is significant that OMB has now issued cost estimates revealing that the Conable dairy proposal would be more than \$1 billion less costly to the Government in the next 4 years than the committee bill, H.R. 4196. At the same time, consumers would save more than \$4 billion during the same period while consuming several billion pounds more of dairy products.

The Director of OMB has outlined this position in a letter to the minority leader, the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., November 4, 1983.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEADER: The Administration has reviewed and updated its estimates of the alternative dairy proposals now pending before the House of Representatives to reflect the continuous changes in the supply and demand factors affecting CCC outlays.

The enclosed estimates were prepared by staff of the Department of Agriculture and reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. They represent our best judgment as of November 1, 1983, and supercede all earlier estimates.

Because adjustments in supply often take many months to measurably affect CCC net outlays, we have provided estimates for a four year period that assumes implementation of new policy on December 1, 1983. We made a neutral assumption about policy in years subsequent to the expiration of temporary changes in law; the law as in effect just prior to its expiration is presumed to remain the policy for the balance of the estimating period. This is in accord with our traditional practice in making such multi-year estimates and reflects the actions of the Congress over the past thirty years.

Certain aspects of the enclosed estimates deserve special attention. Most important is our conclusion that over the FY 1984-87 period, the so-called "compromise" plan embodied in H.R. 4196 will require \$2.118 billion in cash diversion payments to dairy producers and add \$1.036 billion to the deficit compared to the Conable amendment.

Thus no doubt should remain: the Conable amendment would generate very substantial savings over the plan embodied in H.R. 4196. That is just one of the factors that has led the Administration to give its endorsement to the Conable amendment.

We deeply appreciate your efforts to devise a workable and fair solution to the dairy surplus problem. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. STOCKMAN,  
Director.

Enclosure.

#### COMPARISON OF DAIRY ALTERNATIVES

	Fiscal year—				Total 1984-87
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Net CCC budget outlays:					
Current law	1,313	1,423	1,656	1,880	6,272
H.R. 4196	1,203	1,880	1,308	711	5,102
Conable *	1,636	1,253	707	470	4,066
Consumer cost:					
Current law	34,830	37,510	40,660	43,820	
H.R. 4196	36,640	37,510	38,520	40,410	
Conable *	34,770	35,940	37,640	39,930	

\* Assumes use of discretion in accordance with the policy reflected in Secretary Block's letter of Oct. 28, 1983. ●

#### IN DEFENSE OF GRENADA ACTION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, I plan to insert a series of statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to try and counteract the critics of our Nation's successful action in Grenada which led to the rescue of some 700 American medical students.

One of the more persistent criticisms relates to the duration of our involvement in Grenada. The President has consistently maintained that our forces would remain on the island only for a short time in order to accomplish their mission—which primarily was the safe evacuation of all American students.

As an indication of the veracity of his assertion, this morning's Washington Post headline reads, "U.S. To Withdraw 2,300 Troops From Grenada by Friday." In addition to this positive news, Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger informed President Reagan yesterday that all hostilities have ceased in Grenada which formed the basis for the decision to withdraw almost half of our forces from the island.



Credibility in military actions by our Commander in Chief is an absolutely essential element in these United States. There was certainly apprehension among many in this Nation over the decision to commit troops into Grenada. There was also great sorrow in this Nation over the 18 military personnel killed thus far in Grenada. However, because the mission of our military in Grenada was clearly spelled out—and more importantly successful—that factor clearly supercedes the concerns.

The President this morning in a news conference preferred to characterize the military actions in Grenada as a rescue mission as compared to an invasion. Whatever the characterization, I as one American am pleased to see the American students from St. George's Medical College safe and sound on U.S. soil again and I am also pleased over the news that 2,300 American soldiers are leaving Grenada this week. All in all, it was a job well done.●

#### DAY OF SORROW AND IRRECONCILABILITY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. ADDABO. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 1983, Russia will mark the 66th year since the Soviet Government seized power. In that time, we have seen other countries fall under the domination of Soviet rule, or feel the threat of domination. We have debated and disagreed time and again about how we, who enjoy our basic freedoms, can halt the loss of freedom abroad.

As the Soviet Union celebrates, we must leave behind the intensity of debate momentarily, and mourn the loss of freedom. This is a day of sorrow and irreconcilability. We must express our sorrow over injustices and misdeeds the extent of which we can never fully know. We must send out a message that the loss of human freedoms creates a way of life ultimately irreconcilable with our own.

We must make clear to the world that we abhor not only each specific abuse of human rights and each instance of unnecessary suffering, but also the climate of fear that governs the life of each citizen. In our sorrow, we join with fellow Americans who have lived under Soviet rule, or have loved ones living under Soviet domination. They have experienced that pain of the Soviet system directly, and from them we learn a new, fierce devotion to personal freedom.

On this day of mourning, we remember the mass of humanity that has suffered in so short a space of time.

We can give the current victims of the Soviet system hope through our own affirmation of a society in which fear has no place, and individual freedom holds the highest priority.

I include the following news release from the Congress of Russian-Americans, Inc.:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
CONGRESS OF RUSSIAN-AMERICANS, INC.,  
Long Island City, N.Y., October 1983.  
THE DAY OF SORROW AND IRRECONCILABILITY,  
1983

As we approach the 7th day of November, the day when the Soviet Union annually celebrates international communism's arrogation of power in Russia, we—Russian-Americans—appeal to the U.S. Government and to freedom loving citizens of this country to designate this day as the Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability.

Sadly, albeit fittingly, among all the ethnic groups comprising the tapestry of these United States of America, only the Russian-Americans persist in annually asking their Government and their fellow Americans to observe this inglorious day. Russian-Americans feel it is their sacred duty to mark with mourning and defiance the day international communism claimed their former countrymen as their first victim. Moreover, Russians living under Soviet rule acutely realize that with every new nation saddled with the yoke of communism their burden becomes not lighter, but immeasurably greater. Still, their determination to live free blazes as never before.

On this infamous day we express our sorrow for all the victims of communist terror, and our irreconcilability with the theory and practice of communist doctrine.

Last year, our declaration enumerated the crimes committed by the Soviet government within the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. We asked all concerned to share with us our feelings of sorrow and irreconcilability.

This year we wish to emphasize that November 7, 1917 marked not only the beginning of immeasurable sufferings of the Russian and other enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union, but also the beginning of the global human tragedy which today threatens the very existence of the Free World.

By using the territories of the former Russian empire as a base for its attack upon the Free World, while mercilessly exploiting and deceiving its materially and spiritually impoverished citizens, the Soviet government created a mighty military state capable of dictating its will to the Free World. Utilizing the atomic threat, the Soviets gradually take over key strategic positions in all parts of the world.

It seems that today there is not a single nation on the face of the earth that has not been victimized by communist aggression. Today we must count among the communists victim peaceful U.S. citizens who perished in the Korean airliner shot down at the orders of the Soviet government.

Therefore, to stem the tide of communist aggression, we ask the government of the United States of America and, through its good services, all other Free World governments, to designate November the 7th, the day when the Soviets will be displaying their military might, as the Day of Mourning for all Victims of Communist Terror and fly all flags at half-mast.

We also ask representatives of all peoples enslaved by international communism to

join us in conducting memorial services on this day and pray for all those still living under the yoke of communist tyranny.●

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1761

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1761. I want to thank the chairman and members of the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation for their support of this legislation.

H.R. 1761 reauthorizes title I of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, commonly known as the Ocean Dumping Act, at level funding of \$4.213 million for fiscal year 1984. In addition, the bill addresses several current ocean dumping problems and provides strengthening amendments to the act. In summary, the provisions of the bill seek to guarantee that, to the extent we must dump, we do all we can to make sure we have selected the most appropriate dumping sites, that they have been sufficiently studied and that the subsequent dumping is adequately monitored. To accomplish these ends, the bill changes the Administrator's heretofore discretionary site designation authority to perform permanent site designation procedures to a mandatory duty. It requires the Administrator to establish an explicit schedule for completing site designation studies and provides interested parties with the right to seek a writ of mandamus when those studies are not completed, and it requires the Administrator to develop appropriate monitoring programs.

Additionally, the bill changes a discretionary permit processing fee to a mandatory one. It seeks to clarify our obligations under this act to follow the provisions of the London Dumping Convention. Finally, it provides for a program of quality control regarding submitted information and data, and provides criminal penalties for submitting false statements or tampering with monitoring devices.

The Ocean Dumping Act was enacted in 1972 as a result of concern over the effects of unregulated ocean dumping. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, many of the problems that led to the passage of the original act still exist today. In the past few years we have seen increasing pressure to reverse long-standing ocean dumping policy in order to use the ocean as society's garbage dump and sewer system. As more pressure is applied to halt harmful land disposal practices, more pressure is brought to bear on the ocean.

As a resource that is commonly accessible by individuals, cities, and nations, the ocean is not protected by the same economic and political forces that protect private property. Dumpers are not forced to pay for the use of the ocean. Thus, they do not have to pay for the immediate or long-term damage they cause. Unlike land disposal, there is no nearby affected group of concerned citizens to protest the resulting hazards that might be created. Ocean dumping is economically and politically expedient.

It is up to the Congress to provide a voice for the ocean and to insure that it has sufficient protection, so that our future generations will enjoy a healthy and unpolluted ocean environment.

It is for this reason, that I introduced H.R. 1761. Mr. Speaker, this bill strengthens the provisions of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act and provides the needed added protection for our ocean. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

#### A RIVER OF RED INK

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, we have been awash in the past few years in the rhetoric of the budget deficit—from proponents and opponents alike. We have filled the air and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with complaints, resolutions and proposed solutions, yet we have lacked, both as a nation, as a legislative body, the courage and commitment to act.

With all due respect to this Nation's many economists, I have a suspicion that the many facts and figures that we have at hand concerning our Nation's finances compound the problem rather than assist us in finding a way out. Perhaps it is the sheer magnitude of the sums involved. The official \$195.4 billion deficit for 1983, for example, is a number far from any meaningful human scale. Any attempt to simplify it by referring to thousands of miles of toothpicks laid end to end or similar device merely confuses the issue still further. If there is no human scale by which to measure the yearly deficit then how do we illustrate the \$1.4 trillion total national debt?

If the size of the problem confounds both our imaginations and our ability to deal with it, then the conflicting recommendations from these same economists simply add a complex and frustrating icing to the cake.

The most reasonable analysis of America's financial woes is in the evident and quite undeniable effects

upon the people of this country. Do we, we must ask, have sufficient resources to provide for the common safety, basic transportation, the health and welfare of this and future generations and to assure reasonably equal opportunity to our people? The answer is, of course, "No." Resources are stretched thinner, and the choices we in Congress and those on the State and local levels are faced with is how to spread the suffering most equitably.

It seems unconscionable, therefore, to fritter away our Nation's economic resources on interest payments that are merely a constant reminder of our past wastefulness. The \$104 billion annual debt service takes food from the mouths of America's poor, endangers our security and disrupts our society. It is 12 percent of our Federal Government's income that is not wisely spent.

Our national debt will increase by more than 4 percent of our Nation's gross national product per year in 1984—the largest increase since World War II. It will have happened for an unprecedented 3 years in a row.

Economists have pointed out that the debt can be viewed in a positive sense, "keeping the money flowing" into a healthy national economy. Both intellectually and spiritually we reject this argument. In no manner can the mortgaging of our heritage be viewed in a positive light. We have all heard it a thousand times before, but to consistently outspend our income is to set a course for economic disaster.

There are times when Government borrowing in anticipation of revenues is, indeed, necessary and prudent. Municipalities and county governments all over this Nation have shown the direction of this in a fiscally responsible fashion. Those same bodies have amply demonstrated that spending in excess of their resources was damaging, both in the short and long run, and have found ways to reduce spending without abdicating the essential role of government.

We should, therefore, be very suspicious of those who suggest somehow that the deficit is a healthy and routine consequence of good government operations. With the exception of borrowing in short-term anticipation of revenues, we have no evidence whatsoever of any beneficial effect upon our Government. Quite to the contrary, we have a significant body of evidence that the people of our Nation are suffering as a result of our lack of resolve.

#### A DOWNWARD SPIRAL

Perhaps the most alarming feature about this plunge into bankruptcy is the seemingly inexorable nature of it. It reminds me of the businessman, who upon being asked how he went bankrupt replied, "well, slowly at first, then a lot more quickly."

The Library of Congress has estimated that even with the economic recovery in progress, "revenues and outlays are not expected to approach balance \* \* \* for 5 or 6 years." We can look ahead to project that Tax Code changes will lose about \$90 billion in 1984 and even more in the future.

We do not seem to have the resolve, the courage to begin to scale back the costs of our Government. Sadly, we do not even have the plans to do so if we had the courage.

We are not ideologues who speak from a single political perspective without regard to the practical aspects of financing government. I and many of us in this Congress have spent much of our careers in local government bodies where the balance of revenues and outlays was a day-to-day, and down-to-earth process. If government's wallet was empty, then services had to be reduced. I do not propose injuring our security or jeopardizing our population. Yet it has been demonstrated in recent years, and especially in the last few months just how wasteful our Government can be. If we were as ruthless in rooting out overpricing, dishonesty, and wasteful practices as we were in going after the welfare "chiselers" then we might substantially reduce this debt, and set ourselves on the road to recovery.

#### AT THE BEGINNING

I think that we must view the debt crisis in terms of a spiritual commitment. Our extravagant habits in the past years have amply demonstrated a distressing lack of that commitment. Now, even in the smallest way, we must begin to rededicate ourselves to serving the public good, while not bankrupting the public in the process.

I have no easy solutions about how to reduce these deficits. I can only point to the urgent need to do so. We must, it seems, dedicate ourselves to the eradication of the burden on next year's, next generation's resources. We must begin the process of recovery by a commitment to eliminating this debt. The tools are at hand, all that is wanting is the courage to begin.

We can begin by critically reviewing those programs and expenditures that do not directly benefit our population. How can increasing our contribution to the International Monetary Fund by \$8.8 billion, for example, benefit any but the major international banks? We should conscientiously reject the "automatic" increases to the debt. Merely increasing the debt ceiling is not "the next best thing to money in the bank."

Finally we must begin the difficult and painful process of weeding out the extravagant and unnecessary within our governmental operations. The consequences of our deliberations often have names with families to support and, more often than not, wide con-



stituencies to which they can appeal for support at budget time. But there must be no sacred cows, whether we are considering cost-of-living increases, marketing orders, or defense contracts. The fact is that if defense and entitlements were protected from cuts, then every other Federal program, including education, Federal courts, health, environment, welfare, and anti-crime programs would have to be cut by more than 75 percent.

The \$1.4 trillion national debt does not allow us the luxury of further procrastination.●

#### THE NEW H.R. 100

### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months House Energy and Commerce Chairman JOHN DINGELL, Representative BARBARA MIKULSKI, the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues and I have worked hard on drawing up an equitable compromise on H.R. 100, the Nondiscrimination in Insurance Act. Just a few days ago, on October 27, I was pleased to announce that an agreement had finally been reached with the women's, civil rights, and labor organizations supporting this legislation.

As you know, H.R. 100 seeks to eliminate discrimination in all types of insurance and annuities. The bill would prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin. The new compromise maintains this fundamental principle of nondiscrimination, but at the same time eliminates the costs associated with the original H.R. 100.

The compromise does not contain the retroactivity and topping up provisions included in the original proposal. These two provisions of the original H.R. 100 were cited by the insurance industry and others as causing an enormous financial burden on the industry or State and local governments.

As the House Energy and Commerce Committee begins its consideration of the new H.R. 100, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent New York Times editorial in support of this compromise.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2, 1983]

#### INSURE AGAINST SEX DISCRIMINATION

A bill to prohibit sex discrimination in insurance and annuities faces a tough test this week in the House, where the insurance industry is working hard to bury it. The industry's objections are understandable, for this is an issue on which people of good will disagree. On balance, though, there's a very strong case for the compromise now before the Commerce Committee.

The proposal would require companies that sell insurance and annuity policies to treat men and women equally. Why would

anyone oppose it? There are two main objections, both arising from non-sexist issues.

The first concerns longevity. Women typically outlive men. Accordingly, insurance companies charge them lower premiums for life insurance—and higher premiums for annuities. Thus a law requiring unisex premiums, according to insurers, would inject discrimination into a system that's now unbiased.

The trouble with that argument is that though such categorization may be seen as economically neutral, it is not socially neutral. It is illegal to charge higher life insurance premiums to black people (who on average die younger), because we have decided that economic distinctions by race are socially wrong. So, too, are there good social reasons for eliminating economic distinctions by gender, wherever practical.

Is it practical? The insurance industry argues, with good reason, that insurers shouldn't be forced to equalize benefits retroactively, out of their own reserves. But the compromise worked out by the Commerce Committee staff would only require equality of premiums and benefits for the future.

The second objection to equal treatment relates to auto insurance. Women have far fewer accidents than men, so they now typically pay much lower insurance rates. If rates were now equalized, women would end up having to pay much more. Insurers would also have powerful incentives to seek out female customers and reject males.

This problem is more apparent than real. Women have fewer accidents than men mainly because they drive less. By basing rates more on miles driven, insurers will be able to balance their books without drastic changes in premiums.

By eliminating unnecessary legal distinctions between the sexes, Government can make it easier for women to assert their rights as equals in the economy. The anti-discrimination law for insurance is a modest step in the right direction.●

#### "THEY DIED SERVING THEIR COUNTRY"

### HON. NORMAN SISISKY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, in the bombing of Beirut, Lebanon, and the American rescue mission on Grenada, the Fourth District of Virginia lost two men.

Marine Lance Cpl. Warner (Champ) Gibbs, 20 years of age, was 1 of over 200 killed in the bombing of the Marine headquarters in Lebanon.

Army Capt. Michael Ritz was one of the 18 casualties on the island of Grenada.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of these two brave men, who died so gallantly protecting the lives of others, I would like to say they did not die in vain. They died in the most honorable way a man can die—serving their country.

These men were on separate missions of peace. Lance Corporal Gibbs, of Portsmouth, Va., served in Lebanon to relieve some of the pressures upon warring factions in the stricken coun-

try. He did his job and he is a credit to his country, his family, and the Marines.

Capt. Michael Ritz, of Fayetteville, N.C., formerly of Petersburg, Va., was killed at the age of 28 in action on the Caribbean island of Grenada. In the words of his father, retired Col. Robert Ritz, "It's a terrible sacrifice, but it's a lot better sacrifice (to have) eight dead now than two or three thousand later on."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor these two courageous military men. God bless Captain Ritz and Lance Corporal Gibbs, their families and all the other men whose lives were lost in Lebanon and Grenada.●

#### TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. NATHANIEL ROSS THOMPSON, JR.

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, when Lt. Gen. Nathaniel Ross Thompson, Jr., became Inspector General of the U.S. Army on September 1, 1983, he became part of the unique history of the inspector general system which has been carrying on its mission successfully for over two centuries. I know my colleagues join me in wishing General Thompson continued success in his military career. We are fortunate to have individuals of his caliber and professionalism serving our country in the military.

I now submit for the record some biographical information on Lieutenant General Thompson as well as a summary of the history of the inspector general system of the U.S. Army:

LT. GEN. NATHANIEL R. THOMPSON, JR.

Lieutenant General Nathaniel Ross Thompson, Jr., was born on September 5, 1927 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1945, upon graduating from high school, he enlisted in the U.S. Army where he completed airborne training and served with the 82d Airborne Division. After his discharge in 1947, he returned to his native Philadelphia where he attended Temple University and graduated in 1951 with a degree in accounting and an ROTC commission as a Second Lieutenant.

Recalled to active duty, he attended the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. LTG Thompson's early assignments were primarily in the transportation field, which included platoon leader and, later, Commander of the 51st Transportation Company (Truck) in Europe; Commander, 461st Transportation Company, Fort Story, Virginia; and several other company-size units.

LTG Thompson continued his civilian education and received a Master of Business Administration degree, specializing in comptrollership, from Syracuse University in 1958. In his subsequent assignments he served as comptroller, commanded several transportation units, and attended the Transportation Officer Course and the U.S.

Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

After serving in Korea as Plans and Movements Advisor, Headquarters, U.S. Army Advisory Group, he was assigned to Washington, D.C., as Chief, Special Funds and Working Capital Funds Branch, Office of the Department of the Army Budget. He then served in Vietnam as the Commander of the 11th Transportation Battalion and the Director of Transportation, U.S. Army Support Command, Da Nang. Returning to Washington, D.C., he was assigned to the Office of the Special Assistant for Strategic Mobility, Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Directorate for Logistics, J4 and later graduated from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Fort McNair.

In a series of assignments at Fort Eustis, Virginia, LTG Thompson served as Deputy Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Army Transportation School; Commander, 7th Transportation Group; and, again at the Transportation School, as the Assistant Commandant. His next assignments were at MacDill Air Force Base as the Director of Logistics, J4, U.S. Readiness Command and again in Washington, D.C. as Director of Transportation, Energy and Troop Support, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Department of the Army.

LTG Thompson assumed command in July 1979 of the 21st Support Command, U.S. Army, Europe, where he served until becoming The Inspector General for the Department of the Army on 1 September 1983.

LTG Thompson and his wife, Dolores, have five children: Captain Nathaniel R. Thompson, III, Mrs. Kathleen Liesfeld, Mrs. Barbara Burns, Mr. James Thompson, and Mr. Patrick Thompson.

#### THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE U.S. ARMY

The Inspector General System of the U.S. Army began at the suggestion of George Washington with a Resolution of the Continental Congress in 1777. Washington felt the need for a principal assistant to aid him in the training, discipline and development of his growing Army. Although Major General Frederick von Steuben was preceded by three earlier inspectors, he is credited with establishing the high standards of integrity, knowledge and loyalty to conscience which have characterized the system ever since. The office of Inspector General was revived in every early crisis, finally being made permanent in 1821 at the request of Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun. Eventually the Inspectorate became a staff department with full-time members until 1901 when officers from all branches began to be detailed to it for specified periods of duty. Regardless of its composition, the Inspector General System has faithfully performed its role as the eyes and ears of the commander at every level.

Beginning with Baron von Steuben, inspectors have divided their time between matters of training, efficiency and conduct as required by their commanders. The scope of their inquiries has ranged from unit mission capabilities and funds expenditures to the welfare and morals of unit members. Additionally, inspectors have served as channels for subordinates' inquiries and issues of concern which needed command attention. Commanders as different as Anthony Wayne and William Sherman have called the inspectors their "alter ego." The recognized need for an Inspector General System was based on the belief that in addition to all the inspections made by persons

by reason of duty or command, there was needed also inspection from an office without affiliation or responsibility for the command inspected. The System members had to be knowledgeable in military matters, their reports being confidential to allow the unit commander to control situations in his own unit as they developed.

The present mission of inspectors general is to inquire into and report upon matters affecting mission performance and the state of discipline, economy and efficiency of the organization to which they are assigned. Implicit in every function is the duty to train the Army and its members to better meet their requirements and perform their duties.

Inspectors perform general inspections that are systemic and compliance oriented from the lowest echelon up through the vertical echelons of commands in include the Department of the Army Staff and the Secretariat. Inspections are also horizontally oriented to include combat, combat support and combat service support organizations. The functions of the Department of the Army Inspector General include general inspections, training management inspections, and nuclear standardization inspections. Army inspectors general also are the ombudsmen of the Army and handle requests for assistance or compliance from anyone of any grade or station within or without the Army.

The Army Inspector General System investigates allegations of the violation of professional ethics such as the abuse of command prerogatives or mismanagement of the like. It does not handle criminal allegations. The Army Inspector General System is responsible for all inspection and audit followup within the Army be it the Army Audit Agency, the Defense Audit Service or the General Accounting Office.

The allegation is often made that because inspectors general wear the uniform and work for commanders they are not independent. Few in any endeavor are organizationally independent. However, the allegation is moot. The real issue is integrity. All those who serve as inspectors general take an oath upon appointment, to include The Inspector General, to uphold the standards of the Inspector General System. There is no such requirement for auditors and investigators. In the words of a former Inspector General, John C. Breckinridge, the duty of inspectors general is to "touch most firmly the points the generals most need to know." The system has been meeting this requirement successfully for over two centuries.●

#### THE DAY OF SORROW AND IRRECONCILABILITY, 1983

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 7, 1983

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues a statement of the Congress of Russian-Americans, Inc., entitled "The Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability, 1983." I have found this narrative very enlightening and I trust that each of my colleagues will feel the same way. The statement follows:

As we approach the 7th day of November, the day when the Soviet Union annually

celebrates international communism's arrogation of power in Russia, we—Russian-Americans—appeal to the U.S. Government and to freedom living citizens of this country to designate this day as the Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability.

Sadly, albeit fittingly, among all the ethnic groups comprising the tapestry of these United States of America, only the Russian-Americans persist in annually asking their Government and their fellow Americans to observe this inglorious day. Russian-Americans feel it is their sacred duty to mark with mourning and defiance the day international communism claimed their former countrymen as their first victim. Moreover, Russians living under Soviet rule acutely realize that with every new nation saddled with the yoke of communism their burden becomes not lighter, but immeasurably greater. Still, their determination to live free blazes as never before.

On this infamous day we express our sorrow for all the victims of communist terror, and our irreconcilability with the theory and practice of communist doctrine.

Last year, our declaration enumerated the crimes committed by the Soviet government within the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. We asked all concerned to share with us our feelings of sorrow and irreconcilability.

This year we wish to emphasize that November 7, 1917 marked not only the beginning of immeasurable sufferings of the Russian and other enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union, but also the beginning of a global human tragedy which today threatens the very existence of the Free World.

By using the territories of the former Russian empire as a base for its attack upon the Free World, while mercilessly exploiting and deceiving its materially and spiritually impoverished citizens, the Soviet government created a mighty military state capable of dictating its will to the Free World. Utilizing the atomic threat, the Soviets gradually take over key strategic positions in all parts of the world.

It seems that today there is not a single nation on the face of the earth that has not been victimized by communist aggression. Today we must count among the communist victims peaceful U.S. citizens who perished in the Korean airliner shot down at the orders of the Soviet government.

Therefore, to stem the tide of communist aggression, we ask the government of the United States of America and, through its good services, all other Free World governments, to designate November the 7th, the day when the Soviets will be displaying their military might, as the Day of Mourning for All Victims of Communist Terror and fly all flags at half-mast.

We also ask representatives of all peoples enslaved by international communism to join us in conducting memorial services on this day and pray for all those still living under the yoke of communist tyranny.●

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate



Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, November 8, 1983, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## NOVEMBER 9

9:00 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of David A. Zegeer, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health.

SR-485

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 197, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 to provide for a study on the adequacy of certain airline industry practices and Federal Aviation Administration rules and regulations concerning air quality aboard aircraft.

SR-253

## \*Labor and Human Resources

To resume hearings to review Federal and State efforts to impose higher standards in education.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

## Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on the nominations of Susan M. Phillips, of Iowa, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and Daniel Oliver, of Connecticut, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and other pending nominations.

SR-328A

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Charles C. Cox, of Texas, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SD-538

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

## Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

## Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on Senate Resolution 74, expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the future of the people on Taiwan.

SD-419

## Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to evaluate a proposal to request congressional approval for the Carter Library in Atlanta, Ga.

SD-342

## Governmental Affairs

## Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1662, with respect to the authority of the Special Counsel of the Merit Systems Protection Board, S. 1664, to designate the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority as the chief executive and administrative officer of the Authority, and S. 1665, to authorize the President to appoint an employee of the Federal Labor Relations Authority to act as General Counsel during any vacancy in such office.

SD-124

## Judiciary

## Criminal Law Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine capital offenses by Federal prisoners.

SD-226

## Select on Indian Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1196, to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to certain claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe, H.R. 2898, to declare all Federal right, title, and interest in specified lands are held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, and to declare such lands are part of the tribe's reservation, S. 1224, to provide for the disposition of certain undistributed judgment funds awarded the Creek Nation, and S. 1694, to declare that the United States hold certain lands in trust for the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe.

S-224, Capitol

## Joint Economic

To hold hearings to examine the impact on society of the increase in the number of American women entering the work force in the last three decades.

340 Cannon Building

2:00 p.m.

## Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

## Joint Economic

To hold hearings on agricultural and environmental policies.

SR-485

## NOVEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.

## Armed Services

To resume hearings to review the organization, structure, and decisionmaking procedures of the Department of Defense, focusing on the Department of Defense's planning, programming, and budgeting system.

SR-222

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nominations of James L. Emery, of New York, to be Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and Mari Maseng, of South Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

SR-253

## \*Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the nominations of William L. Mills, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Joseph A. Cannon, of Virginia, to be Administrative Assistant of Air for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

## Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on proposed resolutions relating to the safety and deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in Lebanon, including Senate Resolution 248, Senate Resolution 253, Senate Joint Resolution 187, and Senate Joint Resolution 190.

SD-419

## Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to modify the number of Federal holidays.

SD-342

## Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

11:00 a.m.

## \*Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine the strategic petroleum reserve and the Department of Energy's base-line assessment of the SPR program.

SD-366

## NOVEMBER 14

10:00 a.m.

## Judiciary

## Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the role of whistle blowers in administrative proceedings.

SD-226

11:30 a.m.

## Finance

## Health Subcommittee

To resume hearings on long-term health care.

SD-215

## NOVEMBER 15

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the direction of the development of a civil space station.

SR-253

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the current condition of America's coal industry.

SD-366

9:30 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1566, proposed Program Fraud Civil Penalties Act.

SD-342

## Small Business

## Government Regulation and Paperwork Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-511).

SR-428A

## Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the impact of certain coal land exchanges between the Department of the Interior and western land grant railroads, the Burlington Northern & Union Pacific, on the value of Indian-owned coal.

SD-538

10:00 a.m.

## Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on the state of Soviet agriculture.

SR-328A

## Environment and Public Works

To resume hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (P.L. 95-95).

SD-406

## Governmental Affairs

Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Federal employees health benefit programs.

Room to be announced

## Labor and Human Resources

## Aging Subcommittee

To hold hearings to redefine old age provisions contained in the Older Americans Act.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on acquisition of land and acquisition and termination of grazing permits or licenses issued by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to the Taylor Grazing Act (43 USC 315 et seq.) at the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico.

SD-366

## Governmental Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on Federal regulations of the Lobbying Act of 1946.

SD-342

## NOVEMBER 16

8:30 a.m.

## Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint oversight hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the adequacy of VA standards and procedures with respect to funeral and burial services provided for veterans whose remains are unclaimed at VA medical centers.

344 Cannon Building

9:00 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

## Special on Aging

To hold hearings to evaluate the payment procedures of the social security system.

SD-562

9:30 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on private sector initiatives to promote the health and well-being of the American family.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

## Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

## Soil and Water Conservation, Forestry and Environment Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1610, to designate certain lands in Wisconsin as wilderness.

Room to be announced

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

## Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the future of United States and Soviet relations.

SD-419

## Governmental Affairs

To continue oversight hearings on Federal regulations of the Lobbying Act of 1946.

SD-342

10:30 a.m.

## Small Business

To hold oversight hearings on the status of women in the work force.

SR-428A

2:00 p.m.

## Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

## Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the operation and management of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture.

SR-328A

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Regulation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review current gas markets and alternatives for delivery of Alaskan gas through the Alaskan natural gas transportation system to those markets.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.

## Select on Ethics

Closed business meeting.

S-207, Capitol

## NOVEMBER 17

9:30 a.m.

## Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

## Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1300, to insure that rural electric and telephone systems will be able to continue to provide high quality, affordable electric and telephone service to consumers in rural America.

SR-328A

## Finance

## Energy and Agricultural Taxation Subcommittee

## Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings on S. 1768, to provide energy tax credits for certain equipment used aboard or installed on fishing vessels; to be followed by the Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management holding hearings on miscellaneous tax bills, including S. 1332, S. 146, S. 1809, S. 1857, and S. 1758.

SD-215

## Labor and Human Resources

## Handicapped Subcommittee

To hold hearings on section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, relating to institutional care and services for retarded citizens.

SR-428A

9:45 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on Federal arts policy.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

## Environment and Public Works

To resume hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).

SD-406

## Governmental Affairs

## Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To resume hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers' union (HEREIU).

SD-342

## Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 885, to provide for settlement of unresolved claims relating to certain allotted Indian lands on the White Earth Indian Reservation, Minn.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on Federal arts policy.

SD-430

## NOVEMBER 18

10:00 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on issues relating to National Family Week and National Adoption Week, November 20-26, 1983.

SD-628

## NOVEMBER 29

10:00 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Aging Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review targeted scarce resource provisions of the Older Americans Act.

SD-430

10:30 a.m.

## Environment and Public Works

## Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Toxic Substances Control Act (Public Law 94-469).

SD-406

## NOVEMBER 30

9:30 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

## DECEMBER 6

10:00 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

## Aging Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review long-term care policy provisions of the Older Americans Act.

SD-430



31320

DECEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
To hold oversight hearings on the status  
of the job corps program.

SD-430

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DECEMBER 14

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
To hold hearings on pending nomina-  
tions; to be followed by a business  
meeting, to consider pending calendar  
business.

SD-430

November 7, 1983

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources  
To hold oversight hearings on activities  
of the Equal Employment Opportuni-  
ty Commission.

SD-430